

II. REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in the application with claims 1, 6, 13 and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1-6, 8, 14-18, and 21-22 are presently amended, claim(s) 13 and 20 cancelled, and claims 23 and 24 added. Reconsideration of presently pending claims 1-12, 14-19, and 21-24 is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 8 Informality Objection

Claim 8 has been amended to correct the Examiner's indicated typographical error.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-5 and 13-20 were rejected under 35 USC 101 due to the claimed invention being directed to non-statutory subject matter; Claims 1-5 being purportedly directed to a software mechanism and claims 13-20 being directed to a software product. Appropriate revisions have been made in hopes to expedite prosecution and not necessitating agreement with the Examiner's indication of claims being directed to a software mechanism. Claim 1 has been amended to be directed to a method as have claims 14 through 20. Claims 21 and 22 are directed to a computer readable medium.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and 103

Claims 1-7 and 11-22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0233290, hereinafter referred to as Yang). Claims 8, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Luce et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,356,558, hereinafter referred to as Luce).

Claims 1, 6, and 21 all include limitations directed to event elements. Each of the claims also includes a limitation directed to a plurality of event elements occurring at, for example, a single provider. Yang does not provide for such. Claim 1 has been amended to require assigning a predetermined event element to the semiconductor-related product at the secondary provider. Claim 6 provides "assigning event elements to the product...wherein the event elements include a plurality of process steps performed by the secondary provider." Furthermore claim 21, requires instructions for a plurality of event elements for tracking the product, a plurality of event elements being associated with each of the plurality of entities.

In contrast, the Examiner appears to assert that a plurality of event elements as being provided by Yang's disclosure of fab, wafer sort, assembly, and final test manufacturing stages. See office action, page 6. However, these stages do not provide, for example, for process steps at a secondary provider. Yang instead indicates these as provided by separate suppliers; Yang being directed at visibility of the

supply chain including several suppliers within the supply chain for a product. For example, Yang's [0020] provides "The supply orders Final Test from a Final Test supplier. The supply chain management system is able to perform group order generation for groups of dependent suppliers (such as Fab, Wafer Sort, Assembly and Final Test suppliers) in the supply chain." The Examiner's citation of Yang's providing for a plurality of different suppliers, is different than providing a plurality of event elements within a single supplier's performed process. Therefore, the rejections are not supported by the Yang reference and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also indicated elsewhere in the office action, see page 10, that "Yang...does not explicitly disclose assigning event elements." Instead asserting that Luce provides for such. The Examiner continues that Luce teaches a manufacturing route and path in the production process for a work order. Luce describes a route as "a sequence of steps that identifies the plants, operations, and departments that inventory will move through in its production." Col. 12, lns. 2-4. Luce's description of the process steps does not provide claim elements. For example, claim 6, as amended requires, "the information includes a time of an event element and a quantity of the product yielded." There is no indication in the cited portion of Luce of the time an event element occurred and/or a yield, moreover, there is no suggestion by Luce of communicating from a secondary provider to a primary provider. Claim 1, as amended, requires the event element include a "product-specific process parameter." A sequence of steps does not provide a process parameter to be used in one or more of the steps.

Claim 21, as amended, also requires controlling the product quality by at least two of the plurality of entities. Control of product quality is not suggested by the cited portions of Luce and/or Yang. Claim 21 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 22-24 depend from and further limit claims 1, 6 and 21 and are allowable for at least this reason.

In addition, the Applicant's submit that claim 8 as amended is not provided for additional reasons. Claim 8 requires an event element being defined by a secondary provider and modified by a primary provider. The cited portions of Yang and Luce provide no indication of modification of an event element by a primary provider.

Applicant's also disagree with the Examiner's analysis of claim 22. The claim requires at least one of a plurality of different entities. Though Yang discloses a dominating supplier and buyer, and further indicates multiple suppliers, it does not indicate a system where all of these entities are using the same system. For example, the Examiner's cited paragraph [0019] of Yang provides that the process may be useful for an IC-design house, but does not suggest combination of an IC design house, with a semiconductor equipment vendor, for example. Furthermore, the Examiner appears to assert that the

equipment vendor is provided by a discussion of "outsourcing manufacturing industry between buyers and suppliers." Office action, page 9. The Applicant's respectfully disagree, as is the term would be interpreted in light of the specification and one skilled in the art, the equipment includes the hardware and software tools, for example, included in a fab facility. See Applicant's disclosure [0050].

The above discussion of equipment vendor also applies with reference to claim 17. An equipment vendor is not disclosed by mere indication of an assembly supplier. Therefore claim 17 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

New Claims

New claims 23 and 24 depend from and further limit allowable claim 6. Furthermore, claims 23 require transmitting a process parameter and performance of a quality control function respectively, which as discussed herein are not provided by the cited portions of Yang and/or Luce.

Conclusion

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-12, 14-19, and 21-24 is requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if further assistance is necessary. Deposit account number 08-1394 can be used for any over payments or under payments.

Respectfully submitted,




Kelly Gehrke Lyle
Reg. No. 62,332

Dated: July 16, 08
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972/739-8635
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
R-199947

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with
the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on

July 16, 2008


Bonnie Boyle